

Application No. 10/660,003
Response Dated: December 23, 2005
In Reply to Final Office Action dated: August 23, 2005

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated August 23, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-24, 26, 27, 30 and 31 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1, 10, 12, 21, 23, 30 and 31 are amended leaving Claims 1-24, 26, 27, 30 and 31 for consideration upon entry of the present amendment and following remarks.

Support for the amendments are at least found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed. More particularly, support for amended Claims 23, 30 and 31 is at least found in Claims 3 and 14. Claims 1, 10, 12 and 21 are also hereinabove amended to delete ambiguous terms "first" and "second" included in "groups disposed in...layers different from each other" as recited in the claims.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 23, 24, 30 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, U.S. Patent No. 6,025,891 (hereinafter "Kim") in view of Asai , Japanese Patent JP 405150263A (hereinafter "Asai"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; and that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970). Any of the cited references, however, does not teach or suggest all elements of claim 23.

Application No. 10/660,003
Response Dated: December 23, 2005
In Reply to Final Office Action dated: August 23, 2005

Claims 23, 30 and 31 are hereinabove amended to recite, *inter alia*,

“patterning the second metal layer to form the data lines, source electrodes branched from the data lines, and drain electrodes spaced apart from the source electrode on the display region, and to form a plurality of second connecting lines in the peripheral region so that the second connecting lines are electrically and directly coupled to a second group of the scan lines, wherein each of the first connecting lines partly overlaps with at least one of the second connecting lines.”

In the Office Action at Page 4, it is respectfully contended that Kim discloses all of the limitations of Claim 23 except “the second connecting lines electrically coupled to a second group of the scan lines directly,” which is allegedly disclosed by Asai.

Necessarily then, Kim does not disclose a plurality of second connecting lines in the peripheral region so that the second connecting lines are electrically and directly coupled to a second group of the scan lines, wherein each of the first connecting lines partly overlaps with at least one of the second connecting lines as recited in amended Claim 23. Asai also does not disclose this limitation of amended Claim 23.

As Kim and Asai, alone or in combination, *do not teach or suggest all of the limitations* of Claim 23, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding Claim 23 with respect to the Kim and Asai patents.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 23 is not further rejected or objected and is therefore allowable. Dependent claims inherit all of the limitation of their parent claim. Therefore, Claim 24 is correspondingly allowable as depending upon Claim 23. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 23 and 24 is respectfully requested.

As discussed above, Claims 30 and 31 are amended similarly to Claim 23 to also include each of the first connecting lines partly overlaps with at least one of the second connecting lines. Applicants respectfully note that no rejection details are provided for Claim 31. However, as Claim 31 includes substantially similar limitations to that of Claim 23, Applicants generally consider the rejection for Claim 31 in accordance with the discussion for Claim 23.

For the same reasons stated above for Claim 23, Kim and Asai, alone or in combination, also do not teach or suggest a plurality of second connecting lines in the peripheral region so that the second connecting lines are electrically and directly coupled

Application No. 10/660,003
Response Dated: December 23, 2005
In Reply to Final Office Action dated: August 23, 2005

to a second group of the scan lines. wherein each of the first connecting lines partly overlaps with at least one of the second connecting lines recited in Claims 30 and 31. Therefore, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding Claims 30 and 31 with respect to the Kim and Asai patents.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 30 and 31 are not further rejected or objected and are therefore allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 30 and 31 is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's noting Claims 1-22 are allowable.

Claims 26 and 27 are indicated as including allowable subject matter. Dependent claims inherit all of the limitations of their parent claim. Applicants gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's noting the allowable subject matter in Claims 26 and 27, but respectfully submit that independent Claim 23, from which Claims 26 and 27 depend, is allowable, as discussed above. As such, reconsideration and allowance of Claims 26 and 27 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

Application No. 10/660,003
Response Dated: December 23, 2005
In Reply to Final Office Action dated: August 23, 2005

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 
Amy Bizon-Copp
Registration No. 53,993
Cantor Colburn LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
PTO Customer No. 23413
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Facsimile: (860) 286-0115

Date: December 23, 2005